



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,478	09/26/2003	Motoki Imanishi	082418-000100US	8245
20350 7590 09/18/2007 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			EXAMINER JOHNSON, GRANT D	
			ART UNIT 2109	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/672,478

Applicant(s)

IMANISHI, MOTOKI

Examiner

Grant D. Johnson

Art Unit

2109

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/26/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/22/2004, 9/1/2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The phrase "a translucent text edit box that the user types in" should read "a translucent text edit box where the user types in".

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The limitation "the acquired font information" should read "the acquired background image information".

Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claim 9 objected to because of the following informalities:

The phrase "any one of claims 6," should be changed to "claim 6".

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

5. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 which reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

In this case, computer-related inventions whether descriptive or functionally descriptive material are non-statutory categories when claimed as descriptive material *per se* (see *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360 USPQ2d at 1759), falling under the "process" category (i.e. inventions that consist of a series of steps or acts to be performed). See 35 U.S.C. 100(b) ("The term process means, art, or method, and includes a new or a known process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter or material"). Functional descriptive material: "data structures" representing descriptive material *per se* or computer program representing computer listing *per se* (i.e. software *per se*) when embodied in a computer-readable media are still not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. However, a claimed computer-readable *storage* medium encoded with a data structure, computer listing or computer program, having defined structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure, computer listing or computer program and the computer software and

hardware component, which permit the data structure's, listing or program's functionality to be realized, is statutory (see MPEP §2106).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-5 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harvey et. al. (US 6,784,901)(Harvey hereafter).

Regarding Claim 1, Harvey teaches a communication device (i.e. a chat system, as discussed in col. 5, line 17) comprising a letter string editing unit (i.e. a chat text entry area, as shown in 1112 of Fig. 11) a decide input reception unit (i.e. a chat mode button, as shown in 1100 of Fig. 11), a sending unit (i.e. chat sender, as shown in 206 of fig. 2), a reception unit (i.e. chat log, as shown in 204 of fig. 2), a display image generation unit (i.e. chat local display creates and renders the 3D to 2D transition of the chat message,

as discussed in col. 13, lines 59-60), and a display unit (i.e. a local chat area, as shown in 1107 of Fig. 11), wherein:

said letter string editing unit receives an edit instruction for editing a letter string from a user and edits a letter string in accordance with the received edit instruction (i.e. chat text entry area is a translucent text edit box where the user types in his or her message, as discussed in col. 8, lines 49-50);

said decide input reception unit receives a decide instruction from the user together with an operation strength of the user for inputting the decide instruction (i.e. chat mode button allows the user to cycle through various modes of communication, col. 8, lines 36-38);

in a case where the decide input is received, said sending unit sends a sender side message (i.e. a chat wad object, as shown in 502 of Fig. 5) specifying the edited letter string (i.e. a chat message object, as shown in 504 of Fig. 5) and strength information associated with the operation strength (i.e. a chat mode object, as shown in 616 of Fig. 6), to another communication device which is communicably connected to said communication device (i.e. chat sender forwards chat message to all relevant Avatar managers via network and host server, as discussed in col. 13, lines 32-34);

said reception unit receives a receiver side message specifying a letter string to be displayed and strength information (i.e. if chat log determines that a new chat message has been sent to the user, as discussed in col. 13, lines 25-27), from another communication device communicably connected to said communication device (i.e. via network and host server, as discussed in col. 13, lines 34-35);

said display image generation unit generates a display image by depicting the letter string specified in the receiver side message (i.e. chat local display displays the chat message, as discussed in col. 13, lines 65-66), in accordance with a format which is pre-associated with the strength information specified in the receiver side message (i.e. the transition animation parameter can be selected by the chat local display as a function of the chat mode, as discussed in col. 25, lines 8-10);

and said display unit displays the generated display image (i.e. chat local display displays the chat message at the appropriate location in local chat area, as discussed in col. 13, lines 65-66).

Regarding Claim 10, the computer program product implementing the data structure of Claim 1, and Claim 13, the computer readable medium containing the data structure of Claim 1, these claims are substantially the same as Claim 1, therefore same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding Claim 2, Harvey teaches a communication device (i.e. a chat system, as discussed in col. 5, line 17) comprising a letter string editing unit (i.e. a chat text entry area, as shown in 1112 of Fig. 11), a decide input reception unit (i.e. a chat mode button, as shown in 1100 of Fig. 11), a sending unit (i.e. chat sender, as shown in 206 of fig. 2), a reception unit (i.e. chat log, as shown in 204 of fig. 2), a display image generation unit (i.e. chat local display creates and renders the 3D to 2D transition of the

chat message, as discussed in col. 13, lines 59-60), and a display unit (i.e. a local chat area, as shown in 1107 of Fig. 11), wherein:

said letter string editing unit receives an edit instruction for editing a letter string from a user together with an operation strength of the user (i.e. various modes of communication, col. 8, lines 36-38), for inputting the edit instruction, and edits a letter string in accordance with the edit instruction (i.e. chat text entry area is a translucent text edit box where the user types in his or her message, as discussed in col. 8, lines 49-50);

said decide input reception unit receives a decide instruction from the user (i.e. a chat mode button allows the user to cycle through various modes of communication, as discussed in col.8, lines 36-38);

in a case where the decide input is received, said sending unit sends a sender side message (i.e. a chat wad object, as shown in 502 of Fig. 5) specifying the edited letter string (i.e. a chat message object, as shown in 504 of Fig. 5) and strength information associated with the operation strength (i.e. a chat mode object, as shown in 616 of Fig. 6), to another communication device which is communicably connected to said communication device (i.e. chat sender forwards chat message to all relevant Avatar managers via network and host server, as discussed in col. 13, lines 32-34);

said reception unit receives a receiver side message specifying a letter string to be displayed and strength information (i.e. if chat log determines that a new chat message has been sent to the user, as discussed in col. 13, lines 25-27), from another



Art Unit: 2109

communication device communicably connected to said communication device (i.e. via network and host server, as discussed in col. 13, lines 34-35);

said display image generation unit generates a display image by depicting the letter string specified in the receiver side message (i.e. chat local display displays the chat message, as discussed in col. 13, lines 65-66), in accordance with a format which is pre-associated with the strength information specified in the receiver side message (i.e. the transition animation parameter can be selected by the chat local display as a function of the chat mode, as discussed in col. 25, lines 8-10);

and said display unit displays the generated display image (i.e. chat local display displays the chat message at the appropriate location in local chat area, as discussed in col. 13, lines 65-66).

Regarding Claim 14, the computer readable medium containing the data structure of Claim 1, this claim is substantially the same as Claim 1, therefore same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding Claim 3, Harvey teaches that the communication device further comprises a font acquiring unit (i.e. point size drawing parameters are selectable by the sender of the chat message via the sender's GUI, as discussed in col. 16, lines 18-19) wherein:

said font acquiring unit acquires font information designating a font having a size which is pre-associated with the strength information specified in the receiver side

Art Unit: 2109

message (i.e. a predetermined point size that uniquely identifies a whispered chat message, as discussed in col. 16, lines 42-44);

and said display image generation unit generates the display image by depicting the letter string specified in the receiver side message in accordance with the acquired font information (step 908 in Fig. 9).

Regarding Claim 11, the method performed by the communication device of Claim 3, this claims is substantially the same as Claim 3, therefore same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding Claim 4, Harvey teaches a background image acquiring unit (i.e. texture drawing parameters are selectable by the sender of the chat message via the sender's GUI, as discussed in col. 16, lines 18-19) wherein:

said background image acquiring unit acquires background image information which is pre-associated with the strength information specified in the receiver side message (i.e. a predetermined texture that uniquely identifies a whispered chat message, as discussed in col. 16, lines 42-44); and

said display image generation unit displays the display image by depicting the letter string specified in the receiver side message in accordance with the acquired font information, and by overlaying the letter string on the acquired background image information (step 909 in Fig. 9).

Art Unit: 2109

Regarding Claim 5, Harvey teaches that the communication device further comprises a display time acquiring unit (i.e. the chat local display causes textured messages to “fade” from the recipient’s viewport, as discussed in col. 22, lines 23-24) wherein:

said display time acquiring unit acquires a display time which is pre-associated with the strength information specified in the receiver side message (i.e. a predetermined time limit, as discussed in col. 22, line 26) and;

said display unit finishes display of the generated display image, when the acquired display time passes after display of the display image is started (i.e. renders a textured message gradually more translucent, as discussed in col. 22, lines 18-19).

Regarding Claim 12, Harvey teaches a communication method (i.e. a chat system, as discussed in col. 5, line 17) comprising a letter string editing step (i.e. a chat text entry area, as shown in 1112 of Fig. 11), a decide input receiving step (i.e. a chat mode button, as shown in 1100 of Fig. 11), a sending step (i.e. chat sender, as shown in 206 of fig. 2), a receiving step (i.e. chat log, as shown in 204 of fig. 2), a font acquiring step (i.e. point size drawing parameters are selectable by the sender of the chat message via the sender’s GUI, as discussed in col. 16, lines 18-19), a display image generating step (i.e. chat local display creates and renders the 3D to 2D transition of the chat message, as discussed in col. 13, lines 59-60), and a displaying step (i.e. a local chat area, as shown in 1107 of Fig. 11), wherein:

said letter string editing step receives an edit instruction for editing a letter string from a user together with an operation strength of the user (i.e. various modes of

Art Unit: 2109

communication, col. 8, lines 36-38) for inputting the editing instruction, and edits a letter string in accordance with the edit instruction (i.e. chat text entry area is a translucent text edit box where the user types in his or her message, as discussed in col. 8, lines 49-50);

said decide input receiving step receives a decide instruction from the user (i.e. a chat mode button allows the user to cycle through various modes of communication, as discussed in col.8, lines 36-38);

in a case where the decide instruction is received, said sending step sends a sender side message (i.e. a chat wad object, as shown in 502 of Fig. 5) specifying the edited letter string (i.e. a chat message object, as shown in 504 of Fig. 5) and strength information associated with the operation strength (i.e. a chat mode object, as shown in 616 of Fig. 6) to another communication device (i.e. chat sender forwards chat message to all relevant Avatar managers via network and host server, as discussed in col. 13, lines 32-34);

said receiving step receives a receiver side message specifying a letter string to be displayed and strength information (i.e. if chat log determines that a new chat message has been sent to the user, as discussed in col. 13, lines 25-27) from another communication device (i.e. via network and host server, as discussed in col. 13, lines 34-35);

said font acquiring step acquires font information designating a font having a size which is pre-associated with the strength information specified in the receiver side

message (i.e. a predetermined point size that uniquely identifies a whispered chat message, as discussed in col. 16, lines 42-44);

said display image generating step generates a display image by depicting the letter string specified in the receiver side message (i.e. chat local display displays the chat message, as discussed in col. 13, lines 65-66) in accordance with the acquired font information (step 908 in Fig. 9) and;

said displaying image displays the generated display image (i.e. chat local display displays the chat message at the appropriate location in local chat area, as discussed in col. 13, lines 65-66).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of Finkelstein et. al. (US 6,025,841)(Finkelstein hereafter).

Regarding Claim 6, Harvey teaches a display position candidate acquiring unit and a display position selection unit (i.e. the chat local display also determines a start point

and end point for the 3D transition of the textured message in the 3D world, as discussed in col. 16, lines 64-66) wherein:

the sending unit sends the sender side message in which a user identifier assigned to the user is further specified (i.e. the author key, as shown in 508 of Fig. 5);

a user identifier is further specified in the receiver side message received by said reception unit (i.e. determine the author's key who created the chat message, as shown in 806 of Fig. 8);

said display position candidate acquiring unit acquires a plurality of display position candidates which are associated with the user identifier specified in the received receiver side message (i.e. determine a new start and end point as well as recalculate a new rendering path between them, as discussed in col. 19, lines 27-29) and;

said display unit displays the display image corresponding to the specified user identifier at the selected display position candidate (i.e. renders the textured message at that location, as discussed in col. 17, lines 25-26).

However, Harvey does not teach that said display position selection unit provisionally displays the display image corresponding to the user identifier specified in the receiver side message, at the respective acquired display position candidates, in order to calculate an overlap area which is occupied together by any already-displayed display image corresponding to a user identifier other than the specified user identifier and by the provisionally-displayed display image at the respective acquired display position candidates, and selects one display position candidate at which the overlap

area becomes the smallest of all the overlap areas calculated for the respective acquired display position candidates.

Finkelstein, in the same field of applicant's endeavor, teaches that the display position selection unit provisionally displays the display image corresponding to the user identifier specified in the receiver side message (i.e. the target window, as discussed in col. 12, line 25), at the respective acquired display position candidates (i.e. anchor points, as discussed in col. 12, line 39), in order to calculate an overlap area which is occupied together by any already-displayed display image corresponding to a user identifier other than the specified user identifier (i.e. the avoidance region, as discussed in col. 12, line 27) and by the provisionally-displayed display image at the respective acquired display position candidates (i.e. the size of the overlap region is recorded temporarily, as discussed in col. 12, lines 36-37), and selects one display position candidate at which the overlap area becomes the smallest of all the overlap areas calculated for the respective acquired display position candidates (i.e. further steps are taken to determine if placement of the target window in association with one of the other anchor points would provide a lesser overlap, as discussed in col. 12, lines 37-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Finkelstein of determining an optimal display location by minimizing overlap with other windows in combination with the display image generation unit taught by Harvey. One of ordinary skill in the art in the design of such communication devices would recognize that this would optimize the display placement of these windows in a communication application, as minimizing the

overlap between display images would allow a user to view as many messages as possible at once without obscuring older display images.

Regarding Claim 9, Harvey teaches that the communication device further comprises a character image position acquiring unit (i.e. indicating to the recipient the location of the digital representation of the sender, as discussed in col. 23, lines 12-13), wherein:

Said character image position unit acquires a character image and a character display position which are associated with the user identifier specified in the receiver side message (i.e. the Avatar representing the sender of that message, as discussed in col. 23, lines 38-39); said display position candidate acquiring unit refers to each of a plurality of pairs of directions and distances, and acquires as a display position candidate, a position which is apart from the acquired character display position in a direction in a pair, by a distance in the same pair; and said display unit further displays the acquired character image at the acquired character display position (i.e. name tags track an Avatar's motion in the 3-D world, as discussed in col. 8, lines 66-67).

10. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of McKinnon et. al. (US 6,392,667)(McKinnon hereafter).

Regarding Claim 7, Harvey teaches a display position candidate acquiring unit and a display position selection unit (i.e. the chat local display also determines a start point



and end point for the 3D transition of the textured message in the 3D world, as discussed in col. 16, lines 64-66) wherein:

the sending unit sends the sender side message in which a user identifier assigned to the user is further specified (i.e. the author key, as shown in 508 of Fig. 5);

a user identifier is further specified in the receiver side message received by said reception unit (i.e. determine the author's key who created the chat message, as shown in 806 of Fig. 8);

said display position candidate acquiring unit acquires a plurality of display position candidates which are associated with the user identifier specified in the received receiver side message (i.e. determine a new start and end point as well as recalculate a new rendering path between them, as discussed in col. 19, lines 27-29) and which are positions in a virtual three-dimensional space (as discussed in col. 1, line 46) and;

said display unit displays the display image corresponding to the specified user identifier at the selected display position candidate in the virtual three-dimensional space (i.e. renders the textured message at that location, as discussed in col. 17, lines 25-26), and which is seen from the predetermined viewpoint (i.e. 3D viewport, as discussed in col. 1, line 55).

However, Harvey does not teach that said display position selection unit calculates a smallest value of an angle formed by a vector extending from a predetermined viewpoint to each of the plurality of acquired display position candidates in the virtual three-dimensional space, and by a vector extending from the

Art Unit: 2109

predetermined viewpoint to a position in the virtual three-dimensional space of any already-displayed display image corresponding to a user identifier other than the user identifier specified in the receiver side message (i.e. a vector between the perspective viewpoint coordinate and the center coordinate of each of the two objects being compared, as discussed in col. 16, lines 24-26), and selects one display position candidate whose calculated smallest value is the largest of all the calculated smallest values (determining closeness between two objects based on a perspective viewpoint, i.e. as discussed in col. 16, lines 42-43).

McKinnon, in the same field of applicant's endeavor, teaches that said display position selection unit calculates a smallest value of an angle (i.e. if the angle formed between the center of the two objects, as discussed in col. 16, lines 32-33) formed by a vector extending from a predetermined viewpoint to each of the plurality of acquired display position candidates in the virtual three-dimensional space, and by a vector extending from the predetermined viewpoint to a position in the virtual three-dimensional space of any already-displayed display image corresponding to a user identifier other than the user identifier specified in the receiver side message (i.e. a vector between the perspective viewpoint coordinate and the center coordinate of each of the two objects being compared, as discussed in col. 16, lines 24-26), and selects one display position candidate whose calculated smallest value is the largest of all the calculated smallest values (determining closeness between two objects based on a perspective viewpoint, i.e. as discussed in col. 16, lines 42-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of McKinnon of determining an optimal display location in a virtual 3D space by minimizing overlap with other windows, in combination with the display image generation unit taught by Harvey. One of ordinary skill in the art in the design of such communication devices would recognize that this would optimize the display placement of these windows in a communication application, as minimizing the overlap between display images would allow a user to view as many messages as possible at once without obscuring older display images.

Regarding Claim 8, Harvey teaches that in a case where a size when seen from the predetermined viewpoint, of the display image corresponding to the specified user identifier which is arranged at the selected display position candidate in the virtual three-dimensional space, is smaller than a predetermined smallest size (i.e. the chat local display ensures that textured messages will not overlap on the bottom of the recipient's viewport, as discussed in col. 20, lines 60-61), the display unit expands the display image to have a size equal to or larger than the predetermined smallest size (i.e. the chat local display vertically displaces the original textured message, as discussed in col. 20, lines 57-59).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Grant D. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-3626. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 Mon.-Thurs., 8:30-5 Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beatriz Prieto can be reached on 571-272-3902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

\*\*\*

  
BEATRIZ PRIETO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER